



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

find much in this volume of suggestive interest. Particularly so are the passages in which Professor Sidgwick states his views of the respective scope of history and political science and of the relations between them. He discriminates between political philosophy, political science, and political history, but his reader will suspect that his discrimination is rather as to "points of view" (a term which he himself uses, p. 2) than with respect to clearly-defined and mutually exclusive fields of work. He rejects the idea "that the historical method is the one to be primarily used in attempting to find reasoned solutions of the problems of practical politics" (p. 4), and evidently would sympathize but little with the idea of a science of history. But perhaps some of those who would not quarrel with him for that might wish some changes of term in the following sentence (p. 141) in which he states most pointedly the differences he recognizes between history and political science:

The difference, generally speaking, between the scientific and the merely historical treatment of the forms of government and of political society which history presents to us, is that in history proper we are concerned primarily with particular facts, and only secondarily with general laws and types, causes and tendencies; whereas in Political Science we are concerned primarily with the general laws and types, and only with any particular fact as a part of the evidence from which our general conclusions are drawn.

VICTOR COFFIN.

*The Evolution of Modern Liberty.* By GEORGE L. SCHERGER, Ph.D. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. xiv, 284.)

THIS volume, the preface informs us, was originally intended by the author to be a study in the relation between the American and the French bills of rights. While at work on this task; Professor Jellinek's book, *Die Erklärung der Menschen- und Bürgerrechte* appeared, and Dr. Scherger widened the scope of his treatise to include a history of the evolution of modern liberty. In the first two parts of the book the author traces the development of the doctrines of natural law and popular sovereignty from antiquity to the French Revolution; in part III he discusses the American bills of rights; in part IV, the French Declaration; and the volume closes with a chapter on the effects of formal declarations of rights.

The first half of the volume is far from satisfactory. It is a difficult task to condense the history of liberty from the earliest to modern times into a small compass, and the author has not been successful in the attempt. He presents a careful and accurate digest of the opinions of a series of eminent political philosophers, but does not give anything like an adequate description of the great march of events leading up to what we call "modern liberty". Even the evolution of the theory of liberty, viewed as *Dogmengeschichte*, he has not clearly unfolded, while the conditions that make liberty possible and the specific political forms that

human freedom has assumed from time to time he has not attempted to discuss. This is a subject too vast in its extent to fit in easily as a preface to a discussion of modern bills of rights, and the attempt to include it has upset the equilibrium of the volume.

The second half of the book is an essay on the bills of rights in America and France. In this field the work of Dr. Scherger is good, and shows that he need not have been deterred by the previous appearance of Jellinek's volume from presenting his own study. A diligent enumeration of American political theories during the Revolutionary period is given, and also a very interesting résumé of the debates on the bills of rights proposed in the French Constituent Assembly. In agreement with Jellinek and in opposition to Boutmy, the author believes that the American declarations exercised great influence upon the French philosophers. He very properly calls attention to the fact that Rousseau's political theory did not admit of any guaranty of individual rights, and hence that a formal declaration was not regarded as necessary. Even Boutmy must admit that if the Americans did not teach the citizens of the sister republic the principles of the Declaration, at least they instructed them in the dramatic possibilities of such a pronouncement.

The style in which Dr. Scherger's volume is written leaves much to be desired. The method of paragraphing invites criticism and suggests the need of careful revision. The most serious fault, however, is the inarticulate and inorganic character of the narrative. The author displays a constant tendency to enumerate and catalogue the opinions of great thinkers without correlating, elucidating, or summarizing. This trait makes parts of Dr. Scherger's volume resemble an encyclopedia or book of reference rather than a representation of an evolutionary process.

On the whole, the digest of the French discussions on the Declaration of Rights is the most important part of the book. As a history of the evolution of modern liberty, the volume falls far short of the standard; but as a study of the relation between the American and the French bills of rights, it possesses meritorious features. It is unfortunate that the author did not adhere to his original plan and present merely a comparative study in declarations of rights.

C. E. MERRIAM.

*Manuel d'Histoire des Religions.* Par P. D. CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE. Traduit sur la seconde édition allemande, sur la direction de HENRI HUBERT et ISIDORE LÉVY. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1904. Pp. liii, 714.)

THE second edition of Chantepie de la Saussaye's handbook of the history of religions appeared in 1897. A distinct advance upon the earlier edition of 1887, it contained much more that was historical and descriptive and much less that was problematical. In fact the phenomenology of the earlier edition was well-nigh rescinded, and the author contented himself with his real subject-matter, reserving all discussion of